



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/758,203	01/12/2001	Kazuaki Kinjyou	Q62634	8552

7590

12/12/2002

SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN,
MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20037-3213

EXAMINER

WILLIAMS, KEVIN D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2854

DATE MAILED: 12/12/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/758,203

Applicant(s)

KINJYOU, KAZUAKI

Examiner

Kevin D. Williams

Art Unit

2854

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 October 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 07 October 2002 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, applicant recites the language "chamfered."

While applicant may be his or her own lexicographer, a term in a claim may not be given a meaning repugnant to the usual meaning of that term. See *In re Hill*, 161 F.2d 367, 73 USPQ 482 (CCPA 1947). The term "chamfered" in claims 1-7 is used by the claim to mean "rounded," while the accepted meaning is "beveled." Since it is apparent from the drawings that the term that applicant intended to claim is --rounded--, the application has been examined as so.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA) in view of Fromm et al. (US 5,160,130).

Applicant's admitted prior art teaches a recording apparatus comprising removing means for removing a recording medium from the medium fixing member, a thin film toner sheet, said recording medium being fixed to a medium fixing member such that an active surface of the recording medium is facing to the medium fixing member, the removing means having a removing claw, the removing claw having a rectangular cross section with a height reduced toward a tip (specification pgs. 1-10, figures 2, 3, 4, 5, 7).

With respect to claim 7, AAPA teaches a recording method comprising the steps of fixing an image receiving sheet onto the medium fixing member, said image receiving sheet having an image receiving layer to receive an image of a recorded image, fixing the toner sheet onto the image receiving sheet, and removing the toner sheet or the image sheet from the medium fixing member.

Applicant's admitted prior art does not teach an upper side of the rectangle being rounded and the rounded portion having a radius of curvature of $r=1$ mm or more and an upper face of the tip having a face pressure of 1 Kpa or less received from the recording medium being removed.

Fromm teaches a recording apparatus with a removing claw having rounded ends 100.

In view of the teachings of Fromm, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify AAPA to have the ends of the upper side of the rectangle be rounded, as sharp edges can be detrimental.

It also would have been obvious to modify AAPA to have the rounded portion having a radius of curvature of $r=1$ mm or more and an upper face of the tip having a face pressure of 1 Kpa or less received from the recording medium being removed, as it is obvious to modify a particular feature of a device to a specific degree according to the particular device and operation at hand. For example it would be obvious to modify the radius of curvature of the rounded portion according to the overall size of the removing claw.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 10/07/2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the word "chamfered" commonly incorporates the word "bevel." Applicant then states that the word "chamfered" has not been used in the application in a manner repugnant to its usual meaning even under the Examiner's interpretation. As explained in the 112 rejection, the Examiner's interpretation of the word "chamfered" is "beveled", its accepted meaning. In view of the drawings, which clearly show a rounded feature, applicant has used the term "chamfered" in a manner repugnant to its usual meaning, since "beveled" and "chamfered" clearly describe different features.

Applicant also argues that one skilled in the art would not have been motivated to provide the chamfered features of the present invention in light of the tapered section 108 of Fromm. Fromm teaches the tapered section 108 so as to eliminate sharp edges that may come into contact with the sheet, in order to reduce the possibility of

damage to the sheet. In view of this teaching, one skilled in the art would be motivated to round or taper any other portion of the claw that comes into contact with the sheet, in order to reduce the possibility of damage to the sheet by a sharp edge of the claw.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin D. Williams whose telephone number is (703) 305-3036. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30am - 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew H. Hirshfeld can be reached on (703) 305-6619. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)

Application/Control Number: 09/758,203


Page 6

Art Unit: 2854

746-4399 for regular communications and (703) 872-9319 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

KDW
December 4, 2002


ANDREW H. HIRSHFELD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800